

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/791,495	03/01/2004	Paul J. Wehrenberg	APL1P299/P3222	1871
22434 73	590 03/28/2006		EXAMINER	
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP			NGUYEN, HUNG T	
P.O. BOX 7025	50			
OAKLAND, C	CA 94612-0250		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2612	
DATE MALLE			DATE MAIL ED: 03/28/2004	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			,	10/		
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	7—		
		10/791,495	WEHRENBERG, PAUL J.			
Of	fice Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	-		
		HUNG T. NGUYEN	2612			
The I	MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTEN WHICHEVE - Extensions of t after SIX (6) M - If NO period fo - Failure to reply Any reply recei	NED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL R IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D ime may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 ONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute wed by the Office later than three months after the mailin term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1) Respo	nsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 F</u>	ebruary 2006.				
		s action is non-final.				
	this application is in condition for allowa in accordance with the practice under <i>l</i>	nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of (Claims					
4a) Of 5) ☐ Claim(6) ☑ Claim(7) ☐ Claim((s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application the above claim(s) is/are withdra (s) is/are allowed. (s) 1-24 is/are rejected. (s) is/are objected to. (s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.				
Application Par	pers					
9)∏ The sp	ecification is objected to by the Examine	er.				
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>01 March 2004</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
	ement drawing sheet(s) including the correc th or declaration is objected to by the Ex					
Priority under 3	5 U.S.C. § 119					
a)	viedgment is made of a claim for foreign b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority document Certified copies of the priority document Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Burear attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Application rity documents have been received u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)						
	rences Cited (PTO-892) sperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary				
3) 🔲 Information Di	sperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) sclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) lail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	atent Application (PTO-152)			

Art Unit: 2612

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.
- The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).
- 3. Claims 1-4, 9-12, 14, & 18-20 & 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee et al. (U.S. 6,970,095).

Regarding claim 1, Lee discloses a theft device system (10) for detecting loss and location of portable communication device as a laptop computer or cellular phone (12) [figs.1-4, col.1, line 59 to col.2, line 14 and col.4, lines 10-32] comprising:

Application/Control Number: 10/791,495

Art Unit: 2612

- a motion sensor in a form of accelerometer (20) is attached to the laptop / cellular phone (12) for monitoring the theft condition [fig.2, col.1, line 59 to col.2, line14 and col.4, lines 10-32];
- the cellular phone (12) having alarm device (24) to activate an alarm signal (24) when the frequency of the acceleration signal **meets a predetermined criteria** as providing audible signal for detecting theft condition by the motion sensor (20) and a controller in a form of processor (22) connects with filtering circuit (36) to determine the frequencies of the acceleration signal provided by accelerometer (20) and to filter out any frequency indicate of movement of the laptop (12) as protecting the objects from thefts [figs. 2-4, col.2, lines 5-14, lines 27-56 and col.4, lines 18-67];
- the controller / processor (22) may recognize the theft conditions by determine & analysis the frequency of the acceleration signal output as the frequency in the ranges between [0.5 to 2 Hz] by the filtering circuit (36), the alarm device (24) will be activated ONLY when the analysis of the acceleration reveals a possible theft event [figs. 2-4, col.4, line 33 to col.5, line 14, col.7, lines 3-10 and col.10, lines 27-47 l.

Regarding claims 2-4, Lee discloses the accelerometer (20) is attached to the laptop / cellular phone (12) for monitoring the theft condition [fig.2, col.1, line 59 to col.2, line14 and col.4, lines 10-32];

- the cellular phone (12) having alarm device (24) to activate an alarm signal (24) when the frequency of the acceleration signal **meets a predetermined criteria** as providing audible signal for detecting theft condition by the motion sensor (20) and a controller in

a form of processor (22) connects with filtering circuit (36) to determine the frequencies of the acceleration signal provided by accelerometer (20) and to filter out any frequency indicate of movement of the laptop (12) as protecting the objects from thefts [figs. 2-4, col.2, lines 5-14, lines 27-56 and col.4, lines 18-67];

Page 4

- the controller / processor (22) may recognize the theft conditions by determine & analysis the frequency of the acceleration signal output as the frequency in the specified ranges between [0.5 to 2 Hz] by the filtering circuit (36), the alarm device (24) will be activated ONLY when the analysis of the acceleration reveals a possible theft event [figs. 2-4, col.4, line 33 to col.5, line 14, col.7, lines 3-10 and col.10, lines 27-47].

Regarding claim 9, Lee discloses a theft device system (10) for detecting loss and location of portable communication device as a laptop computer or cellular phone (12) [figs.1-4, col.1, line 59 to col.2, line 14 and col.4, lines 10-32] comprising:

- a cellular phone (12) having a housing for holding and covering semiconductor components is inherently [fig.1];
- the cellular phone (12) having alarm device (24) to activate an alarm signal (24) when the frequency of the acceleration signal meets a predetermined criteria as providing audible signal for detecting theft condition by the motion sensor (20) and a controller in a form of processor (22) connects with filtering circuit (36) to determine the frequencies of the acceleration signal provided by accelerometer (20) and to filter out any frequency indicate of movement of the laptop (12) as protecting the objects from thefts [figs. 2-4, col.2, lines 5-14, lines 27-56 and col.4, lines 18-67];

- the controller / processor (22) may recognize the theft conditions by determine & analysis the frequency of the acceleration signal output as the frequency in the ranges between [0.5 to 2 Hz] by the filtering circuit (36), the alarm device (24) will be activated ONLY when the analysis of the acceleration reveals a possible theft event [figs. 2-4, col.4, line 33 to col.5, line 14, col.7, lines 3-10 and col.10, lines 27-47].

Regarding claims 10-12, Lee discloses the accelerometer (20) is attached to the laptop / cellular phone (12) for monitoring the theft condition [fig.2, col.1, line 59 to col.2, line14 and col.4, lines 10-32];

- the cellular phone (12) having alarm device (24) to activate an alarm signal (24) when the frequency of the acceleration signal **meets a predetermined criteria** as providing audible signal for detecting theft condition by the motion sensor (20) and a controller in a form of processor (22) connects with **filtering circuit (36)** to determine the frequencies of the acceleration signal provided by accelerometer (20) and to filter out any frequency indicate of movement of the laptop (12) as protecting the objects from thefts [figs. 2-4, col.2, lines 5-14, lines 27-56 and col.4, lines 18-67];
- the controller / processor (22) may recognize the theft conditions by determine & analysis the frequency of the acceleration signal output as the frequency in the specified ranges between [0.5 to 2 Hz] by the filtering circuit (36), the alarm device (24) will be activated ONLY when the analysis of the acceleration reveals a possible theft event [figs. 2-4, col.4, line 33 to col.5, line 14, col.7, lines 3-10 and col.10, lines 27-47].

Regarding claims 14 & 18, Lee discloses the controller / processor (22) may recognize the theft conditions by determine & analysis the frequency of the acceleration signal output as the frequency in the specified ranges between [0.5 to 2 Hz] by the filtering circuit (36), the alarm device (24) will be activated ONLY when the analysis of the acceleration reveals a possible theft event [figs. 2-4, col.4, line 33 to col.5, line 14, col.7, lines 3-10 and col.10, lines 27-47].

Regarding claims 19-20 & 24, Lee discloses a method of protecting a portable communication device as a laptop computer or cellular phone (12) against theft [figs.1-4, col.1, line 59 to col.2, line 14 and col.4, lines 10-32] comprising:

- a motion sensor in a form of accelerometer (20) is attached to the laptop / cellular phone (12) for monitoring the theft condition [fig.2, col.1, line 59 to col.2, line14 and col.4, lines 10-32];
- the cellular phone (12) having an output signal to activate an alarm signal (24) when the frequency of the acceleration signal meets a predetermined criteria and for providing audible signal as detecting by the motion sensor (20) and a controller in a form of processor (22) connects with **filtering circuit (36)** to determine / examine the frequencies of the acceleration signal provided by accelerometer (20) and to filter out any frequency indicate of movement of the laptop (12) as protecting the objects from thefts [figs. 2-4, col.2, lines 5-14, lines 27-56 and col.4, lines 18-67];
- the controller / processor (22) may recognize the theft conditions by determine & analysis the frequency of the acceleration signal output as the frequency in the specified

ranges between [0.5 to 2 Hz] by the filtering circuit (36), the alarm device (24) will be activated ONLY when the analysis of the acceleration reveals a possible theft event [figs. 2-4, col.4, line 33 to col.5, line 14, col.7, lines 3-10 and col.10, lines 27-47].

4. Claims 5-8, 13 & 15-17 & 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al. (U.S. 6,970,095) further in view of D'Angelo et al. (U.S. 6,133,830).

Regarding claims 5 & 13, The reference of Lee does not specifically mention the controller unit having a sleep mode as claimed by the applicant.

D'Angelo teaches a sleep mode function which is controlled by a microprocessors (27,32) for reducing power supply requirement [col.8, lines 49-53].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to use the teaching of D'Angelo includes a sleep mode feature in the system of Lee for controlling & saving the power supply and extending battery life.

Regarding claims 6-8 & 15-17, The reference of Lee does not specifically mention the controller unit connects with alarm device as visual signals as claimed by the applicant because that is old and well known in the art.

Art Unit: 2612

Furthermore, D'Angelo teaches an anti theft device which having visual / LED indicator and audible device (31) to communicate with microprocessors (27,32) for triggering alarm of theft condition [col.7, lines 26-50].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to use the teaching of D'Angelo in the system of Lee for providing multi alarm signals to the users.

Regarding claims 21-23, The reference of Lee does not specifically mention the controller unit connects with alarm device as visual signals as claimed by the applicant because that is old and well known in the art.

Furthermore, D'Angelo teaches an anti theft device which having visual / LED indicator and audible device (31) to communicate with microprocessors (27,32) for triggering alarm of theft condition [col.7, lines 26-50].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have the teaching of D'Angelo in the system of Lee for providing multi alarm signals to the users.

Arguments & Responses

5. Applicant's argument filed on Feb. 03, 2006 have been fully considered but they are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 2612

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP j 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hung T. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-2982. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 9:00 am to 6:30 pm.

Art Unit: 2612

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Horabik, Michael can be reached on (571) 272-3068. The fax phone number for this Group is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

HUNG NGUYEN PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner: Hung T. Nguyen

Date: Mar. 22, 2006